# HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 35 Saturday, August 31, 1957 Washington, D. C.

**News Section** *Printed in Two Sections*

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

**ATOMS:** *ICBM vs. "peacetime uses"* (page 1)

**1960:** *Conservative crystal-gazing* (page 1)

**MODERN GOP:** *Debacle in Wisconsin* (page 2)
*Legislative defeats* (page 3)

**PRESS IN CHINA:** *By invitation only* (page 4)

**Ballistic Missile:** Experts in the Capital today express great concern over the claim by Moscow that Russia possesses an intercontinental ballistic missile. It may be so, may not — censorship blurs facts at this date. Anyway, these experts believe that the Soviets have made much progress in this line of work.

The news, they say, may serve to alert this country to an ominous situation. It is believed that Soviet Russia has had a "crash program" for the development of such a missile since the end of the last war. These experts also emphasize that, if we had had a "crash program" during the same period, we could have achieved a remarkable "technological breakthrough" long ere this.

Instead, we have devoted a large part of our scientific and technical work to "peacetime" development of the atom, of electronic devices, gadgets, etc. In the weapons field, we have dissipated our efforts with no priority program carried out on a crash basis. This permits the Russians to overtake us.

Too many scientists in high places manifest a complete disinterest if not reluctance to work on weapons of war, and prefer to labor on "peacetime" research and development. This "pacifistic" tendency of the scientific community constitutes one of the most alarming aspects of the situation. These men, the critics charge, seem to have no sense of responsibility for the protection of their country, nor its survival against the Soviet threat.

All this poses a very critical question, particularly in view of the time, money and energy devoted to building "peacetime reactors" and to the uneconomic atomic production of electric power.

HUMAN EVENTS for July 20 quoted Admiral H. G. Rickover, who pointed out that — it is estimated — the Shippingport "peacetime" reactor (on which millions have been spent) would produce electricity at a cost of over ten times the price charged by local electrical power companies in its area. In short — the question is asked — why waste money and talent on such activities while the Soviets concentrate on producing a global missile?

David Shea Teeple, author of the HUMAN EVENTS piece, "Nuclear Nonsense" (February 11, 1956), brought the matter to a focus a year ago in a Congressional hearing, May 8, 1956. He said: "I admit that atomic reactors are delightful things to heat houses with, but I would much much rather have an intercontinental ballistic missile and supersonic nuclear-propelled aircraft that could fly in an unlimited range. I think that we should have been working on these during the past seven years."

**Presidential Preview:** Two hard facts hit the Nation's Capital in the past week, with exciting consequences:

(1) The first was the overwhelming defeat of Ike's publicly blessed candidate for Senator, Walter Kohler, outstanding "modern Republican," in the by-election in Wisconsin this week (for story see page 2). "The best thing that has happened to the GOP for a long time," said one prominent GOP member of Congress.

(2) The final funeral services, from one end of talky Capitol Hill to the other, for the badly defeated Eisenhower legislative program.

The consequences: Presidential talk in unprecedented volume, in very animated discussions, over drinks and luncheon tables "downtown" as well as on "the Hill." Such talk, of course, is by "pros" whose reasoning and considerations are not clearly understood by the "amateurs in the sticks," or the general public. But, that's the way boomlets are designed and Presidential myths created.

Here follow three names, in order — not necessarily of eventual importance, but of immediate incandescence, as a result of events:

● LAUSCHE, Senator from Ohio, whose measure has been taken by the pros, particularly after one event — his memorable interview on "Meet the Press" last Sunday.

"Lausche did it again," is the saying, as he did on his TV interview of a year ago. Integrity, candor, and the extraordinary combine of stubborn adherence to principles and the curious modesty and diffidence of a freshman Senator.

Summing up: He's out, all out, for a "right-to-work" law, and for economy in Government — another issue to which he remains strikingly faithful. "The U.S. Government must lead [in economy] and then the Chief Executive and the states and municipalities. . . ."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He went on: "I think the right to work in our country is just as sacred as the right to vote and the right to a jury trial. I don't believe any organization in our country should be vested with the right and power to say to an American: you shall not work unless you join my organization."

And: "The President of the Teamsters Union in our country has greater power than the President of the United States or the Congress, and in my judgment labor has reached a point where it must take its position of responsibility with others."

Presidential ambitions? "He who seeks the Presidency never gets it . . . The Presidency comes to the person who is at the proper place and at the proper time."

The pros, fascinated but cautious, ask: but will the Democratic party, controlled by Reuther, shake off its labor boss shackles in time for '60?

● HUMPHREY. Here the sophisticated pros take over. Not unmindful of his liabilities — age and the status of great wealth — they see the former Secretary of the Treasury as a symbol. His "hair-curling" utterance voices the fears of the new middle class: workers watching their wages pared by inflation, pensioners worrying about prices, rising small businessmen thwarted by the Great Pinch — and all desiring the restoration of "an honest dollar." That — the great popular movement against high taxes, high prices and Government spending — is the "hottest" force in political America today. So runs the reasoning of the pros. Therefore, Humphrey is a "natural" and "could sweep the country."

He does not want it, but "the Presidency comes to the person." He'll have many friends and admirers ready to release the boomlet.

● KNOWLAND. Here the talk becomes complicated, as is always the case when the candidate has "stuck his neck out" on many issues.

**But one report rivets thoughts of party politicos. Friends of the Californian say he will come out, in his expected race for the governorship of that state, for a state "right-to-work" law.**

This report — to politicos — spells the doom of Knowland's opponent, Governor Knight, in the gubernatorial race. Certainly, they say, it will kill Knight in his bid for the GOP nomination. Various conservatives, chilled by Knowland's desertion of states' rights on the "civil rights" bill battle, would then presumably rally again behind Knowland against the pro-labor boss incumbent, Knight.

Politicos, who think the "civil rights" issue will die down, believe Knowland will fill the vacuum created by Knight's apostasy on the labor question. And — again professional thinking — a Republican (at least 75 per cent "right" on issues), at the head of a big-population state delegation to the national Convention in '60: that's four-league boots towards a nomination which, they believe, is distinctly not foreclosed.

In short, the mixed metaphor in the Capital is — the king is dead, long live the king, and the field is open.

**What Happened in Wisconsin:** Both in Wisconsin and in Washington, the sensational victory of Democrat Proxmire over "liberal" Republican Kohler for the Senatorial seat is interpreted as a defeat for "modern Republicanism."

Wisconsin sources reporting to HUMAN EVENTS stress the bitter split in the Republican party and the vigorous revolt against "Kohlerism." During the campaign, Mrs. Robert Murray — a vice chairman of the GOP state committee — refused to sign a party letter endorsing Kohler. Wisconsinites and recent visitors to the Dairy State arriving in Washington in the past 24 hours say that many conservative Republicans had voted for Proxmire "to get rid of Kohler once and for all." Others reportedly stayed at home. One Wisconsin observer described the "hatred" of Kohler among right-wing elements as "bitter and unrestrained." Especially resented — it is said — was a statement by Kohler during the campaign, criticizing Congress for cutting Ike's heavy foreign aid requests.

Representative Melvin Laird (R.-Wis.) called the vote "a protest against the high Budget and foreign aid spending of the Administration." This view is regarded as significant, since Laird has had good relations with Kohler in the past. Mrs. Jean McCarthy, the late Senator's widow, told the press that the vote was a repudiation of "modern Republicanism." Wisconsin, she said, is "essentially Republican" and is "unalterably opposed to 'modern Republicanism.' It is unfortunate the only way the people of Wisconsin could express this was to support a 'liberal' Democrat." It is known that this view is privately endorsed as sound by prominent GOP Senators.

Around Capitol Hill, it is said that Vice President Nixon leans to the view that "agricultural unrest" was the principal factor in the defeat. The view of Representative Lawrence Smith, a veteran GOP legislator from Wisconsin, on the matter was otherwise: "I don't think it was the farm revolt by a long shot [Smith's own district is about 40 per cent rural]. Of course, you can't make precise diagnosis now. It will take a month's study of election-district returns to give a comprehensive answer. But, in my opinion, it was a revolt against Government spending — particularly foreign aid expenditures — which was the biggest factor. Kohler slavishly followed the Administration line on this. That does not go down well in Wisconsin today."

When Edwin R. Bayley, a political writer for the Milwaukee *Journal*, a "liberal" organ favorable to Kohler, said "the outcome seemed to prove once again that coattail riding was vain," he stated in mild form what many Republican Senators and Representatives are saying — although rather privately, for reasons of "party discretion." They draw the lesson that "modern Republicanism" doesn't win elections. (It is ironically

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recalled that sheer "winning" — rather than adherence to GOP principles — is the credo of the Palace Guard.)

A number of GOP Senators, up until now pious followers of Ike, obviously would prefer that he not give them his blessing in their election fights next year — such is GOP cloakroom talk. It is considered significant that Democrat Proxmire told the Associated Press that his victory was "a protest against the President and his policies" rather than a positive vote for himself.

Some Republicans on Capitol Hill take the view that the defeat is a "good thing"; that this, added to the Administration bungle in the McKinney affair (see story below), may lead to a revision of the Administration's "modern Republican" policy.

**But was the debacle solely the Palace Guard's responsibility? Well-placed insiders report that the Kohler strategy was "masterminded," nay dictated, by no other person than former New York Governor Thomas E. Dewey himself. These insiders say that Dewey, through his "men" in the White House and Administration, presumed to impose his "modern Republican" line on the party in Wisconsin.**

**Another Political Boner:** The bungling of the Palace Guard in promoting such "modern Republicans" as Kohler came piled (like Pelion on Ossa) on the incredible McKinney Case — which has brought Republican tempers here to a boiling point. What happened was that the White House announced its intention to name Robert McKinney, Santa Fe, N.M., newspaper publisher, as U.S. delegate to the a-borning International Atomic Energy Agency (see BRICKER AMENDMENT II, HUMAN EVENTS, August 24).

McKinney is an ardent internationalist Democrat whose personal and editorial support of Adlai Stevenson in last year's campaign bordered on the adulatory.

Two versions are in circulation as to why the White House decided that McKinney's should be the lone U.S. voice among the 80 which will decide what happens to American atomic materials turned over to the IAEA. One is that it was a deal between AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss and New Mexico's Democratic Senator Clinton Anderson, vice chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee. The deal was to win the support (for the basic IAEA Treaty) of Anderson, without whose backing it might not have been ratified.

The second is that Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson persuaded Presidential assistant Sherman Adams that McKinney's appointment would be a nice gesture of bipartisanship and would help win Democratic support for the President's legislative program (a highly questionable thesis).

In any event, when word leaked out of the planned designation, New Mexico Republicans, led by one-time Secretary of War Pat Hurley and National Committeewoman Mrs. Floyd W. Lee, protested violently by telephone and telegram. Hurley promptly made the trek to Washington to protest in person.

At least three top GOP leaders went to the White House to protest bitterly (but unavailingly, apparently) to Adams: National Committee Chairman Meade Alcorn, Senatorial Campaign Committee Chairman Andrew Schoeppel, and Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Richard Simpson.

**Kennedy:** Senator "Jack" Kennedy ruffled supporters who have billed him as a "conservative" when he unfurled his true colors on the floor of the Senate last week. Kennedy submitted a bill, S. 2828, which would give the Palace Guard unlimited authority to pump foreign aid funds into Communist countries such as Poland and Yugoslavia.

On the grounds that a country can be only "slightly Communist," Kennedy's bill would break down the trade barriers imposed by the Battle Act, and place it within the President's "discretion" to decide if foreign aid money and surplus food stocks funneled to Communist slave governments would be in the interest of "freedom-loving peoples."

The proposal earned Kennedy a stern rebuke from GOP Leader William F. Knowland: "It seems to me that the Senator is now asking the American people to undertake a whole economic plan of bolstering the Communist world."

**Knowland added: "Unless the Senator from Massachusetts is going to propose additional funds for these Communist-controlled nations in addition to the mutual aid program, then the only source of the funds will be the nations which are standing up with us in opposing the Communist menace."**

**Conservative Victories:** As a "Trojan horse" movement to paralyze conservative resistance from within, "modern Republicanism" has failed — such is the verdict of observers reviewing the fate of the "liberal" phases of President Eisenhower's program. They cite the following:

- The "economy wave," the single greatest phenomenon of this session, rolled on until the end. Instead of cuts of $3 billion or so, as originally anticipated, the Eisenhower Budget sustained slashes close to $5 billion.
- Foreign aid, in spite of "liberal" attempts to restore previous cuts in full, found itself shipwrecked on the stubborn resistance of House conservatives.
- "Federal aid to education," perennial favorite of the "liberals," was once more defeated.
- The "civil rights" bill, advertised as a "victory" for the Administration, was in reality a defeat. The bill drafted by Attorney General Brownell was cut to ribbons, and the final version was largely the handiwork of Senate Democrats.
- The Administration's attempt to scuttle the Walter-McCarran Act ended in total failure.
- The much-ballyhooed "Atoms for Peace" plan, backed by all the resources of the Administration, wound up tightly regulated by Congress. Observers agree that the provision in the enabling statute removing Presidential control from materials sent abroad defeats

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the purpose of the act for "liberals" — provided the law is observed by the Executive branch.

● The Administration was balked in its attempt to legislate the U.S. into the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which would implement the notorious "GATT" agreement.

**Newsmen in China:** Two schools of thought are contending, among anti-Communists in the Capital, over the significance of last week's developments in the "newsmen in China" controversy.

One school believes that Red China — in turning down the Dulles proposal to grant special passport privileges to 24 U.S. news organizations — showed its unwillingness to have Westerners see the economic and political misery of the Chinese people. According to this view, the Peking regime has stirred up the "freedom of information" issue solely for propaganda purposes, and has never intended to follow through with it.

The opposing school believes that the Reds want to let Western reporters in — as a prelude to trade and eventual recognition — if they can pick the reporters.

Those holding this view refer back to the almost forgotten fact that, when Red China first dropped its press ban against foreign reporters last year, it cabled "invitations" to a group of Western newspapermen. Secretary Dulles subsequently referred to this action by the Red Chinese as an attempt to "handpick" correspondents.

A comparison of the "handpicked" list with the list rejected last week, these anti-Communists point out, reveals some interesting differences. At the time that the Red Chinese issued their invitation (August 6, 1956), the event was only partially reported, so that a complete list of invitees does not appear in the newspapers of that date. From authoritative sources, however, HUMAN EVENTS has obtained the list of 18 who were invited by the Red Chinese.

Of these, 13 are individuals, or represent organizations, that "overlap" with the list of 24 designated by our State Department: Robert Miller, UP; John Roderick, AP; C. L. Sulzberger, Tillman Durdin, Henry Lieberman, *New York Times;* Gordon Walker, *Christian Science Monitor;* Kingsbury Smith, INS; Walter Kerr, *New York Herald Tribune;* Robert Martin, *U.S. News and World Report;* Dan Kurzmann, McGraw-Hill; James Robinson, NBC; Sam Jaffe, CBS; James Burke, Time, Inc.

The five others invited by the Reds are individuals, or represent organizations, excluded from the State Department list: Marquis Childs, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch;* Seymour Freidin, *New York Post;* Harrison Forman; Edgar Snow; Anna Louise Strong.

The *Post-Dispatch* and the *New York Post* are extreme "liberal" newspapers with a long record of bitter opposition towards Nationalist China. The latter three writers, described as "free-lance" correspondents, all labored in the "agrarian reformer" vineyard of the 1940's, selling the Chinese Communists to the American people.

The State Department's list, however, not only excluded these writers; it also threw in some firmly anti-Communist media that had not received invitations from the Reds. These included the Chicago *Tribune,* which had designated veteran reporter Chesly Manly for the post, and the Mutual Broadcasting System, which features a number of anti-Communist broadcasters — including Fulton Lewis, Jr.

In short, these observers believe, the Red Chinese would be perfectly willing to initiate trade relations by accepting Western newsmen, if they could be sure that in the process, their regime would receive — from some of the correspondents — the "whitewash" treatment.

**Conservatives Gather:** Chicago's LaSalle Hotel will be the scene of a "National Tax Protest Rally," expressing opposition to Big Spending and heavy taxation, Friday evening, September 13. Featured speakers at the meeting, sponsored by *Free Men Speak,* will be Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn (R.-N.Y.), radio and television commentator Dan Smoot, and President of the American Progress Foundation Willis E. Stone.

The rally will be followed by the third annual convention of "We, The People" — a conservative political action group — September 14 and 15. Principal speaker at the "We The People" meeting will be former Utah Governor J. Bracken Lee, now chairman of "For America." Governor Lee will address the convention fresh from an extended speaking tour of the country, and will report on grass roots sentiment against the Federal income tax (for the story of Lee's colorful and controversial career, see "J. Bracken Lee, Budget Cutter," by Frank C. Hanighen, in article section of this issue).

**Lee De Forest,** "Father of Radio," celebrated his 84th birthday, August 26, by ordering a copy of E. Merrill Root's article, "The Tax Slaves" (HUMAN EVENTS, July 27, 1957), sent in his name to each of the 531 members of Congress. Mr. De Forest writes:

"HUMAN EVENTS furnishes a weekly commentary on national affairs, as seen from the conservative, anti-leftist, anti-socialistic viewpoint. These disclosures are especially essential today when most of the big Foundations are stealthily undermining the American free spirit that has made them rich."

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.**
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
*Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 35 HUMAN EVENTS August 31, 1957

**Article Section** *Printed in Two Sections*

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

# J. BRACKEN LEE—BUDGET CUTTER

*By* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

WHEN Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah came out for repeal of the income tax, he won headlines throughout the country. When he proved that he could cut the Utah state budget over the opposition of the New Dealish legislature and the special spending interests, he achieved a triumph — much less well known throughout the Nation, but of more enduring fame among all the front fighters in the war for economy.

An account of Lee's political career offers a guidebook for the task of slashing spending — a task made extremely difficult by the opposition of the mighty forces of "giveaway." If President Eisenhower had called in this experienced statesman last January to chart the course of cutting the 1958 Federal Budget, he would have avoided many of his present political and economic troubles. For the case history of Bracken Lee offers an invaluable lesson in the art and technique of a reform increasingly demanded by the great mass of the tax-burdened American people.

The story can be properly started in the opening months of 1949 — a year which now seems to belong almost to another epoch, so profoundly have public attitudes on fiscal matters changed in the meantime. In that year, the climate on Capitol Hill in Washington and in the various state capitals was one of unrestrained and unabashed big spending. The Truman re-election victory, the preceding November, was widely interpreted as a victory for the spendthrift policies of the Fair Deal. In New York, Governor Dewey — with his unusual genius for reading the wrong lesson into election results — had reversed his formerly sound economic policy and had gone hell-bent for the welfare state. Indeed, observers remarked that "demagogic Tom" was vying in a sort of national boondoggling contest with a new Democratic figure just risen on the horizon — Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois.

But, in this national picture, there arose an exception. This writer, conversing one day that spring with a member of the Utah Congressional delegation, heard for the first time of a quite contrary phenomenon. "We have out in Utah a Republican Governor," said our friend, "who ran on an economy platform, got elected over his Democratic opponent — a big spender — and now, b'gosh, is sticking to his promises to slash the budget. All hell is breaking loose out in Salt Lake." Then the Utah man showed me a sheaf of newspaper clippings from his local papers about the iconoclastic doings of Governor J. Bracken Lee. Perusal of these did indicate that something new was stirring in the Beehive State.

Hardly had Lee seated himself in the Executive chair in the State House in Salt Lake City than he proceeded to carve big chunks out of the budget requests presented to him by state bureaucrats — and by many millions of dollars. He began by firing large numbers of state employees — the reverse of the customary policies of Governors desirous of rewarding their faithful election campaign supporters. He not only wielded the knife and inserted it rudely, he turned it around with the utmost cruelty; for one of his steps was to eliminate "gravy" long enjoyed by state bureaucrats, by stopping personal usage of state-owned automobiles. He boldly proposed that he could save $10,000 per annum by moving the offices of the state unemployment security system (hitherto an untouchable sanctuary) to cheaper available space.

ALL THIS, of course, constituted (in that Keynesian era) not only economic, but also political heresy. The special interest groups were in an uproar. Lee, remarked one political leader, in three months "has managed to alienate more voting groups than any other man I know." Outraged Utah New Dealers consoled themselves by predicting sure defeat for such a Chief Executive if he dared to run again. This writer, reporting the new phenomenon in HUMAN EVENTS for May 11, 1949, referred to the "day of judgment" at the succeeding election as "a test, not only for Lee, but for the citizens of Utah, who with or without their eyes open, voted for an economy candidate against a 'spending' candidate."

But worry over what might happen at the next hustings failed to sway the new Governor. Faced with department spending requests totaling $81.5 million, he whacked away at the mountainous (for Utah)

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demands until all that was left was a budget of $43.9 – the request he submitted to the 1949 legislature. That body was solidly Democratic and imbued with much of the New Deal philosophy of "tax and spend." It was not surprising, then, that the legislature upped the budget ante to almost $53 million, then withheld the appropriations bill from the Governor until it was too late in the session for him to send it back with his veto.

Lee faced two alternatives: (1) he could let the bill become law without his signature and denounce the Democratic legislature as spendthrift; or (2) he could veto the entire bill and summon the legislature back in special session to write a new one.

No matter which alternative he chose, Democrats reasoned, he would lose much of his budget-cutting glamor. On the one hand, he would be saddled with a spending program much beyond his own desires, and on the other he would be adding to legislative costs by summoning a special session at which, in all likelihood, he would be unable to persuade legislators to cut down any of the appropriations they already had made.

The consequence of these alternatives was well understood by the Utah Chief Executive. He steered clear of both of them and came up with a plan of "item-vetoing" those parts of the appropriations bill which he felt were too far out of line. His "item vetos" could be made without affecting the rest of the appropriations bill and would not require a special legislative session.*

Lee "item-vetoed" almost $4 million from the total appropriations made by the Democratic legislature, leaving several agencies of government high and dry without funds. One of these agencies, a vocational school, had asked for an appropriation of over $1 million, yet continued to operate (on tuition and fees) despite the veto. Perhaps it was the fact that this agency, like others, did not wither up and die that calmed some of the furor the Governor's budget-cutting had stirred up.

By such courageous policies and skilful maneuvering, the Governor reached the end of his first budget period (two years in Utah) by showing sharply reduced and balanced budgets. And he had accomplished this record by proving that the cost of government could be reduced without impairing essential services. By 1950, it was evident that his policies pleased the majority of the people – "the people who get little more out of government than the right to pay taxes," as he describes them.

By 1950, Lee had arrived – at least in Utah and surrounding states, and in the columns of HUMAN EVENTS. At the annual Governors' conferences, he had begun to interest some of his colleagues – such as Lausche of Ohio. But, while big circulation magazines edited in the East gave some attention to Lee, they treated him more as a sort of curiosity than as the focal point of a developing national trend. They certainly did not "take him up," in contrast to their lavish boosting of "liberal" gubernatorial figures (in the postwar era), such as Arnall of Georgia and Stevenson of Illinois.

On one of Lee's visits East, I lunched with him together with another veteran Washington correspondent (whom I brought along as a checkrein to my developing liking for the Governor's cause). As usual, we sought to probe him in every way possible, to seek any contradictions, weaknesses or "cover-ups" in his talk or behavior. He proved to be pleasant, but not professionally genial; earnest but not fanatical; proud to relate his accomplisments, but not especially desirous of "selling himself"; deeply confident – a bit naively so, we both thought – in his expectation that the people would continue to support him; convinced and sincere – persuasively so – in his stated adherence to his principles. We left the luncheon enthusiastic about this rarity among politicians – albeit ready to be skeptical, out of long and bitter experience with the breed.

Lee, after proving that the budget could be cut, began the second half of his first term by preparing to pass on to the taxpayers the fruit of his labors in the form of tax reductions. As usual the innovator, Lee (in his opening message to the 1951 session of the legislature) recommended a reversal of the age-old procedure of appropriating money to meet the state's "needs," then levying taxes to pay the bill. He recommended instead that the legislature first reduce taxes, then cut its spending to fit the anticipated revenues.

"Immediately the objection will be raised that this will prevent the establishment of any new services," he continued, anticipating his objectors, "even though they may be more essential than some we now have."

"The answer to this, of course, is that we should either eliminate some of the less essential services or reduce the appropriations made for them. As matters stand . . . our first resort is always to increase the tax and our last [is] to reduce or eliminate the non-essential services. At this rate, it will never be possible to reduce the size and cost of government."

As much as anything, it was Lee's ability to distinguish between the spenders and lobbyists on the

* While Lee favors the "item veto" on the state level, he opposes it on the Federal level. He believes that in Washington it would place too great a power in the hands of the Executive over the Congress and would be open to misuse. On the state level, he points out, the situation is different: because of the smaller territory involved, misuse would become more quickly known and would bring early reaction from the electorate. Modern Presidents, however, depend on "palace guards" and a vast network of Federal bureaucrats, who would wield the "item veto" for political reasons to blackmail the legislative body into line.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one hand and the ordinary taxpayers on the other, coupled with his utter fearlessness of and disdain for pressure groups, that made him an expert at cutting expenses and balancing budgets.

The ordinary pressure tactic of trying to overwhelm him with numbers usually backfired on the group employing the strategy. Instead of causing him to weaken his position, the efforts of a large group frequently had the opposite effect. Lee reasoned that a group with a just cause didn't need a crowd to sell it; therefore, he grew suspicious whenever large lobbying groups descended upon him for an interview.

As a matter of fact, his reputation with lobbying groups grew to the point that some of them, before seeking an audience with the Governor, would inquire about the number of people they could bring and still not be classed as a crowd.

Facing a crowd, Lee generally handled himself with a calm assurance that belied his fighting nature. He frequently could agree with do-gooders that their cause was a worthy one – but where, he would ask, does the money come from? Then he would launch into a discussion of his philosophy of government and his refusal to seek more taxes in a state which he once described as "one of the highest taxed states in the union." (Needless to say, Utah didn't achieve that position as a result of Lee's actions.)

His philosophical outbursts generally were couched in easily understood, down-to-earth language, the substance of which seemingly had escaped the grasp of bureaucrats in Washington. A good example was contained in his message to the 1951 legislature:

"We must awaken to the hard realities of finance if we are going to preserve the economy of this nation . . . Government does not differ from the family, the corner drugstore, or the large corporation. Each must live within its income, or otherwise face eventual bankruptcy."

THE PAYOFF for Lee's economy program came in 1952 when the Governor ran for re-election on a platform of reducing taxes. Despite the predictions by the politicos that Lee – because of alienation of many special interests – would be defeated, he defeated his Democratic opponent by proportionately the same comfortable margin as in 1948.

As usual a man of his word, Lee prevailed upon (this time) a Republican legislature to reduce taxes as its first order of business, then to tailor its appropriations to the revenue available.

Tax reduction, or maintaining as low a level of taxes as possible, is a cornerstone of Lee's policy. Whenever tax increases were proposed, he insisted that increases be made only by the people themselves through referendum. Such a procedure was opposed by the various branches and agencies of government having taxing authority, on the grounds that it was too cumbersome and costly a procedure.

Nevertheless, Lee was able to push through a law concerning school financing which required local school boards to seek the approval of their taxpayers before they could increase the cost of their programs beyond a specified limit.

Not long after this law was approved, in 1955, a number of school boards, at the insistence of organized teachers, placed before their taxpayers proposals to increase the cost of the school program beyond that specified limit. In Salt Lake City, such a proposal was made without opposition and was being promoted on spurious grounds – until Governor Lee re-entered the picture, not so much to oppose the increase as to bring out the truth regarding it.

Arrayed against him at the time were the organized teachers, the PTA, organized labor, the Salt Lake county Democratic organization and the two Salt Lake dailies.

Undaunted by this formidable opposition, Lee scheduled several speeches before civic organizations and saw to it that his talks were covered by the newspapers. He had no other publicity means. Initially, the pro-increase forces felt they would ignore the Governor, but as soon as they measured the tremendous impact of his talks they launched their counterattacks: speakers, radio, television and newspaper advertising, postcard and telephone campaigns, newspaper editorials. The great debate was on.

Given more time and some money for advertising, Lee likely could have turned the tide and defeated the increase proposal. As it was, he achieved a moral victory of considerable proportion simply by turning a shoo-in election into a tight race. The proposal finally carried by about 850 votes – a margin which could be accounted for by the teachers themselves, who numbered 1500.

Having predicted the eventual outcome, Lee was not surprised that he lost. Actually, he had nothing at stake in the election except principle and truth, since he was then living in the state-owned, tax-exempt Governor's residence.

"You may wonder why I keep sticking my neck out and particularly at this time when apparently I have so little involved," he said in one of his speeches. "The answer to that lies in my concern for the future – the future of this country, this state, and our communities, and the future of our children.

"To me the future is worth fighting for. If it were not, I would not take the abuse that goes with this job. It is a much easier thing for me to say 'yes' to all the demands for services and money that come before me. It is a battle to say 'no.' Sometimes I feel there are not enough people who care one way or another to make it worthwhile for me to go

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through with these battles. When I feel that way, I must still reckon with my conscience, and I am glad for that.

"I would not want this job if, in order to avoid battles and personal abuse, I felt obliged to do things I did not believe to be right. In the present debate, I am convinced I am right; and as long as I believe this, I will continue to speak out until the issue is settled."

The popularity of the cause, the personal abuse, did not bother Lee if he believed he was right. Thus, he tackled such sacred cows as the school lunch program, from which he wanted state funds withdrawn for use elsewhere, and the state's junior colleges, whose numbers he tried to reduce by abolishing one and giving two others back to the Mormon Church. He lost both battles.

But meanwhile, by his stand, he indirectly won victories for his cause. His mere presence in the state capital served to head off costly new legislation, since sponsoring groups were reluctant to have their bills reach his desk if a veto was imminent.

HOWEVER, concurrently with his fight for a sound budget and lower taxes in his second term, came a development which proved more dangerous to him than disgruntled teachers, special handout seekers or Keynesian spenders.

During the primary campaign in 1952 Lee was one of the few Republican Governors who supported Taft. And Lee followed the Ohioan when the latter called for unity in the party in September 1952 to elect Ike. A candidate for re-election, Lee campaigned vigorously for the entire Republican ticket and along with assuring his own election helped elect not only President Eisenhower but a GOP state administration and legislature as well.

But, as the new Eisenhower regime began to form, Lee received fewer invitations to speak at party meetings. After Taft's death, as the Ike regime tended more and more towards what later became known as "modern Republicanism," this rift between the Utah Governor and Washington became more noticeable. "I'm still saying the same things I was saying in 1949," he remarked, "and I'm still doing the same things. I haven't changed my policies or principles, but it is certainly evident that the party has."

Such observations by Lee increased and in 1954, in a speech September 22, in San Francisco, he accused the President of carrying forward a program that is "just as evil under the Republican party as it was under the Democrats." He called for an end to foreign aid. The fact was that Lee foresaw the fiscal mess and the inevitable rise in the Federal Budget which became visible to others only in 1957.

In the campaign of 1956, he hoisted his standard for re-election – to a third term. A number of political advisers considered this a dangerous step, as in Utah there is traditional sentiment against third terms for Governors (Lee's Democratic predecessor suffered from this sentiment). Additionally (and perhaps more decisively) there was the growth of "modern Republicanism" in the hierarchy of the party in the state, fed from the "Palace Guard" in Washington.

When the primary came, this force worked against him and in harness with New Deal Democrats. The latter – for the primary was open – were rallied to "cross the line" and to vote for Lee's opponent. This maneuver, it is said, was actually engineered by GOP Senator Arthur Watkins, leader of the Utah "modern Republicans." Those Democratic votes were sufficiently numerous to beat Lee. Then he ran as an independent in the general election, and – although he piled up an impressive vote – failed to win.

Since that election, Lee has spent his time making speeches throughout the country, urging a reduced Budget and tax reform. It is rumored that he may run for the Senatorial nomination against Watkins next year.

As one observer of contemporary politics, I think it tragic that the conservative elements in the country—political leaders, leaders of business and especially conservative publishers – failed to build up and lift this extraordinary man to the national position of leadership he deserved. But the bitterest tragedy – in my opinion – is this fact: the Republican party, which maintained its existence for 20 years under the New and Fair Deals by faithful support from those believing in sound economic and fiscal policies, neglected to utilize this outstanding state executive, who had proved that such policies can be made to work and can bring wide public support.

**HUMAN EVENTS** was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.**

**ORDER BLANK**

**HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.**

Send me.....reprints of "J. BRACKEN LEE—BUDGET CUTTER"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately – at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED